

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-7 are pending in the application.

Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being unpatentable over Ziegler et al. (US6,778,867B1).

Claims 3-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ziegler et al. (US6,778,867B1).

The Applicants traverse the rejections and request reconsideration.

***Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)***

Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being unpatentable over Ziegler et al.

In maintaining the rejection of the claims, the Examiner contends that the Applicants define a pendant in the Specification as an enabling switch and a circuit adapted to interlock with the enabling switch to generate a driving signal for a servo power supply of the robot. The Examiner points out to page 5, paragraph 1, of the Specification, which according to the Examiner can be interpreted to mean a micro-processor or a CAN controller.

The Examiner is believed to be incorrect for several reasons. Importantly, page 5, paragraph 1, clearly notes that the pendant “includes” an enabling switch and a circuit adapted to interlock. However, a pendant is neither synonymous nor equivalent to an enabling switch and a circuit adapted to interlock. The Examiner is incorrect in his conclusion that anything that has an enabling switch and a circuit that is adapted to interlock is a pendant. The Specification clearly notes in page 1, paragraph 2, that a portable teaching apparatus that is used for teaching industrial robots is called a pendant. Reading the Specification, as a whole, would convey to a skilled artisan that a pendant is used for teaching a robot.

Secondly, the Examiner further notes that a microprocessor or a CAN controller can be considered to be pendant. This again is a mischaracterization, even under the Examiner's own limited definition of a pendant. Any microprocessor cannot be considered to be a teaching pendant.

To further clarify the subject matter of the invention, the Applicants amend the claims to replace a pendant with a "teaching pendant." Clearly, there is no indication in Zeigler that any of the controllers are used to teach the robot.

To anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102, the reference must teach every element and limitation of the Applicant's claims either explicitly or inherently. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 are proper only when the claimed subject matter is identically disclosed or described in the prior art. See MPEP § 2131. In fact, the identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as contained in the claim. Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co., 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

The Examiner has not established anticipation of claims 1 and 2 by Zeigler at least because of the above-noted differences between the teachings of Zeigler and the present invention.

***Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)***

Claims 3-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ziegler et al..

Claims 3-7 are dependant on claim 1, and therefore, are unobvious over Ziegler at least for the reasons discussed above.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the

Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Chidambaram.S.Iyer/

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON DC SUGHRUE/265550

**65565**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

---

Chid S. Iyer  
Registration No. 43,355

Date: June 12, 2008